

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13, 14, 16, and 17 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice to refile. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claim 15 as well as to clarify the invention that is claimed. Additionally, claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, and 14 have been amended to clarify the invention that is claimed as well as to correct obvious typographical errors. Lastly, claim 16 has been amended so that it is now dependent upon claim 1. None of the amendments to the claims is intended to narrow the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the claims.

As a preliminary matter, applicants note that the Office action indicated that claims 15-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. (Office action, p. 7). As the recitations of allowable claim 15 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 8, and claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice to refile, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8 are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 16, and 17 depend from claim 1, and claims 9, 10, 13, and 14 depend from claim 8, and are, therefore, allowable for at least this same reason.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(a) because “the first and second latches recited in claims 4-5 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” (Office action, p. 2). As applicants have cancelled claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 without prejudice to refile, the objections to the drawings are moot. Consequently, applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

The Abstract of the disclosure has been objected because of informalities. (Office action, p. 2). Applicants have amended the Abstract in accordance with the examiner’s suggestions. Consequently, applicants respectfully request that the objections to the Abstract be withdrawn.

The disclosure has been objected to because of informalities. (Office action, p. 3). Applicants have amended the disclosure to overcome the objections and, therefore, respectfully request that the objections to the disclosure be withdrawn. Additionally, applicants have amended the title to correct an obvious typographical error. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

Lastly, claims 1-3 and 8-10 have been objected to because of informalities. (Office action, p. 3). Applicants have amended claims 1-3 and 8-10 to overcome the objections and to clarify the invention that is claimed. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the claims. Consequently, the objections to claims 1-3 and 8-10 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 102(b)

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly “being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.” (Office action, pp. 3-4). As applicants have cancelled claims 4, 5, 11, 12, and 15 without prejudice to refile, the rejections of these claims are moot. With respect to the remaining claims, applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 8, and 14 to overcome the rejections. Specifically, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite “a delay model, which receives the signal outputted from the delay line,” in accordance with the examiner’s suggestion. Consequently, the rejection of claims 1 and 8 should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 16, and 17 depend from claim 1, and claims 9, 10, 13, and 14 depend from claim 8, and are, therefore, allowable for at least this same reason. Additionally, claims 7 and 14 have been amended to recite that “the delay value of the delay means is smaller than a half period of the non-delayed input clock signal.” Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, pages 21-22. Consequently, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Lastly, claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Eto et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,049,239 (“Eto et al.”). (Office action, pp. 4-7). As set forth above, as applicants have cancelled claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 without prejudice to refile, the rejections of these claims are moot. Additionally, because the recitations of allowable claim 15 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 8, and claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice to refile, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8 are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1, and claims 9, 10, 13, and 14 depend from claim 8, and are, therefore, allowable for at least this same reason. Applicants do not otherwise address the characterizations of Eto et al. put forward in the Office action and reserve the right to traverse such characterizations.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit the application as a whole is in condition for allowance, and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest convenience. The examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney with any questions or comments regarding this amendment, or the application as a whole.

Respectfully submitted for,
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

September 7, 2004

By: Marla L. Hudson
Marla L. Hudson
Reg. No. 43,680
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 474-6300